DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 132 926 HE 008 486

AUTHOR Greene, Robert T.
TITLE The Impact of the Commonwealth of Virginia's State Supported Colleges and Universities Academic Tenure and Faculty Activity Study Conducted by the State Council of Higher Education on the University of Virginia.
SPONS AGENCY American Council on Education, Washington, D.C. Academic Administration Internship Program.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 42p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Cost Effectiveness; *Data Collection; *Faculty Workload; Higher Education; *Job Tenure; Policy Formation; Professors; *State Action; State Colleges; State Surveys; State Universities; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Dismissal; Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS Teacher Reappointment; *Virginia

ABSTRACT

Three basic questions set the direction and scope of this study: (1) What factors precipitated the development and passage of Senate Joint Resolution No. 106 that directed the State Council of Higher Education to conduct a tenure-faculty workload survey among the state-supported institutions of higher education? (2) What are the perceptions of individuals representing various interest groups relative to the use of data collected by the State Council? (3) From the State Council's point of view, what questions will be answered by the data-gathering process? Responses to these questions suggest that the Virginia General Assembly is well on its way in joining other states, such as New York, Michigan, Florida, and California, in setting into motion procedures for decreasing the cost of higher education, for scrutinizing more closely the activities of faculty, and for assessing the status of tenure policies and procedures. Implications for initial appointment and review, reappointment, tenure, and post-tenure review are discussed. (LBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED132926

THE IMPACT OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA'S STATE SUPPORTED COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ACADEMIC TENURE AND FACULTY ACTIVITY STUDY CONDUCTED BY THE STATE COUNCIL OF HIGHER EDUCATION

ON THE

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

A Paper

Presented To

Dr. Thomas M. Stauffer
Director, Academic Administration Internship
Program
American Council on Education

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

By

Robert T. Greene, Ed.D
American Council on Education Fellow

1975-76 Internship Year

HE008486

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
1.	Introduction.....	1
2.	Academic Tenure-Faculty Activity Survey, University of Virginia.....	4
3.	Participants in the Study.....	7
4.	Basic Questions.....	8
5.	Analysis of Findings.....	8
	A. What Factors Precipitated The Development And Passage of Senate Joint Resolution No. 106 Which Directed The State Council of Higher Education To Conduct A Tenure-Faculty Workload Survey Among The State-Supported Institutions of Higher Education.....	9
	B. What Are The Perceptions Of Individuals Representing Various Interest Groups Relative To The Use Of Data Collected By The State Council Of Higher Education.....	10
	C. From The State Council's Point-Of-View, What Questions Will Be Answered By The Data Gathering Process.....	12
6.	Selected Comments	
	A. Legislative Comments.....	13
	B. University of Virginia Administrative Comments.....	13
	C. University of Virginia Faculty Comments.....	14
	D. Other Academic Administrative Comments (IPAC).....	15
	E. Student Comments.....	16
7.	Summary, Conclusions, Recommendations.....	16

TABLE OF CONTENTS CONT'D

Page

8. Tables

A. Table 1: Responses of Representatives of Various Interest Groups Regarding The Factors Which Precipitated The Development and Passage of Senate Joint Resolution Number 106..... 21

B. Table 2: Perceptions of University Administrators, Faculty, Students, and Other Academic Administrators Relative To The Use Of Faculty Tenure and Workload Data Collected By The State Council on Higher Education..... 23

C. Table 3: Responses of Selected State Council Of Higher Education Officials Regarding The Questions To Be Answered By The Data Gathering Process..... 27

9. Bibliography..... 29

APPENDIX: Form: Faculty Activity Survey

THE IMPACT OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA'S STATE SUPPORTED COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ACADEMIC TENURE AND FACULTY ACTIVITY STUDY CONDUCTED BY THE STATE COUNCIL OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Introduction

Academic tenure in higher education has been under discussion for several decades by academicians, professional higher education associations, legislators, and other interest groups. Policies and procedures regarding academic tenure and faculty workloads (activity) vary from one campus to another and from one state to another.

In the past fifteen years, concern for the overall status of academic tenure and faculty workloads gained momentum. This increase in concern, as expressed by many professionals, legislators, alumni, parents, and other interested individuals, was influenced by such factors as the following:

1. Student activism, as evidenced by riots, campus take-overs, and campus demonstrations of the 60's and early 70's,
2. Activist ideas expressed by students,
3. So called "liberal minded" professors,
4. Increasing costs of higher education,
5. Perceptions of some legislators and other influencial individuals that tenured faculty were not productive,
6. Controversies and law suits involving institutions and faculty members relative to promotions, appointments, reappointments, awarding tenure, and faculty evaluations,
7. Workloads of faculty,
8. Decreasing college enrollments,
9. Open admissions, and
10. Formation of faculty bargaining units.

With decreasing public confidence in higher education, college and university officials and faculty find themselves on the defensive daily in maintaining the quality of their programs and the national and international status achieved through hard work over the years. The attacks upon higher education can, as expressed by Hechinger, be viewed clearly from the following:

1. America is in headlong retreat from its commitment to education. Political confusion and economic uncertainty have shaken the people's faith in education as the key to financial and social success.

2. What makes the situation so serious is that education, caught in an unprecedented pincer attack, is under siege from two politically opposite directions. Conservatives who never really liked universal education and are particularly cool toward the massive expansion of college enrollments have been joined by the politically left, which views education as an evil tool of capitalism.

3. They(revisionist) denounced the schools for Americanizing diverse ethnic groups and fitting them into an essentially middle-class socioeconomic pattern or, as they would put it, mold.

4. Gloomy forecasts predicted that by the decade's end hundreds of thousands of PhD. recipients would have to take jobs considerably below their academic station, displacing equal numbers of those with only bachelor's degrees, who in tern would bump job-seeking high school graduates.

5. Commissions headed by sociologists and other prestigious opinion-makers have recently been pounding away at the theme: how best to reduce the number of years of compulsory schooling.

6. Strong currents of political and economic conservatism have raised questions about the value of general education.

7. In this Bicentennial year no other objective seems more urgent than helping the American people regain their faith in education. [1]

Controversies, law suits, and Federal directives over faculty contracts, promotions, awarding tenure, faculty evaluations, working conditions are adding more fireworks to the problem situation in higher education. Colleges and universities are experiencing an increase in faculty activism. According to Lussier, "faculty dissatisfaction over promotion,salary, working conditions, university governance, among others, have caused professors in a number of institutions of higher learning in recent years to choose collective bargaining agents to represent their interests." [2] She indicated further that:

> Three national organizations have become the major contenders for this purpose: American Association of University Professors (AAUP), American Federation of Teachers (AFT), and the National Education Association (NEA). Faculty dissatisfaction and disagreement over issues are often reflected in opposing positions and goals of different faculty organizations. Nationally, the policy statements of each of the faculty organizations are statements of general principle, varying in their degree of specificity, ranging from general guidelines of the AFT to the more specific ones established by the AAUP. [3]

Some critics of academic tenure would not hesitate to supplant it with some other system. Carr indicated that "tenure for the college professor has long had its critics as well as its defenders, but it is doubtful that the assault has ever been as varied and aggressive as it is today." [4] The extent of criticisms was clarified further by Carr in the following manner:

---

[1]Fred M. Hechinger, "Murder In Academe: The Demise of Education," Saturday Review, March 20, 1976, p.p. 11-18.

[2]Virginia Lee Lussier, "Faculty Bargaining Associations," Journal of Higher Education, Vol. XLVI, No. 5, September/October, 1975, p. 507.

[3]Ibid., p. 508.

[4]Robert K. Carr, "The Uneasy Future of Academic Tenure," Educational Record, Spring 1972, p. 119.

> On the campus, tenure is attacked by student activists on the ground that it protects poor teachers against evaluation by their customers. Graduate students, apprehensive about their professional careers, favor modifying or even abolishing tenure as a way to open up what has suddenly become a tight job market for young academicians. College presidents are unhappy with tenure on several grounds, but principally because it protects professors who resist the institution's need to engage in educational experimentation and who are thus "a brake on change." Some professors themselves are indifferent about the tenure system, believing it an unnecessary protection for the able and a haven for the lazy or incompetent.[5]

Academic Tenure-Faculty Activity Survey
University of Virginia

The issues raised in the aforementioned passages are very much alive in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Probably the first action taken in contemporary Virginia to assess the status and needs in higher education was that of the first State **Secretary** of Education who in 1971 authorized an "audit of productivity" in education. The prevailing view of many persons who either participated in the audit or were aware that the audit was in progress was that very little was accomplished by that effort.

The next action taken in the Commonwealth to assess the needs in higher education was the passage of Senate Joint Resolution Number 21 during the 1972 session of the Virginia General Assembly. This resolution which was passed overwhelmingly by both houses created the General Assembly Commission on Higher Education. The role of the Commission, as presented in the resolution,is as follows:

> Whereas, Virginia has many high quality state-supported institutions of higher learning; and
>
> Whereas, the financing of these institutions, as well as the other diverse services provided by the Commonwealth, is a heavy responsibility; and

---

[5]Ibid., p. 119.

> Whereas, such financing should be organized and coordinated, so as to maximize cooperation among such institutions, minimize competition for funds, and promote the development of an overall plan for higher education; now, therefore, be it
>
> Resolved by the Senate of Virginia, that there is hereby created the General Assembly Commission on Higher Education, which shall consist of nine members, of whom six shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Delegates from the membership thereof and three shall be appointed by the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections from the membership of the Senate, for the purpose of examining the system of higher education in the Commonwealth. It shall, among other things, consider possible improvements in the method of determining the financing of the institutions, in the coordinated planning of the higher educational program, and in the establishment of priorities in the development of a more unified educational system. [6]

The study by the Commission was two years in duration, the substance of which was derived from members' independent study, consideration of testimony gathered in meetings with college presidents and the Commission's consultants.[7] It was significant to note that the Chairman of the Commission on Higher Education, the Honorable Senator Mr. Edward E. Willey, was one of the patrons of the Senate Joint Resolution Number 106 passed by the General Assembly January 14, 1975 and which directed the State Council of Higher Education to conduct a study of academic tenure in Virginia's state supported colleges and universities. The resolution is presented below:

> Whereas, a policy known as academic tenure has developed in almost all colleges and universities in America and has historically been regarded as a means of ensuring academic freedom; and
>
> Whereas, between nineteen hundred sixty-eight and nineteen hundred seventy-three, the proportion of the nation's faculty members who have tenure has increased by one-third and now stands at sixty-five percent; and

---

[6]General Assembly Commission On Higher Education, Report of the General Assembly Commission on Higher Education to the General Assembly of Virginia, (Richmond, Virginia: Commonwealth of Virginia, 1974), p.p. 1-2.

[7]Ibid., p. 2.

Whereas, the increase in tenured faculty members has important budgetary and curricular implications for all institutions of higher learning; and

Whereas, institutional flexibility will be greatly diminished as the proportion of tenured faculty increases, especially during the next decade when college enrollments are expected to level off and actually decline; and

Whereas, prestigious national commissions and educators recommended a re-evaluation of tenure policies; and

Whereas, no Statewide study of the impact of tenure on Virginia's State-supported institutions of higher education and their faculties has been conducted; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of Virginia, the House of Delegates concurring, That the State Council of Higher Education is directed to study tenure policies in the State-supported institutions of higher education in the Commonwealth, to evaluate the criticisms of academic tenure made during recent years, and to recommend needed modifications or improvement in the tenure system.

In addition to studying the policies and procedures employed for granting tenure and the removal of tenured faculty members, the study shall include but not be limited to consideration of the number of courses, hours, and students taught by faculty members, other faculty activities and responsibilities, teaching schedules and performance evaluations.

All agencies and institutions of the Commonwealth shall assist and cooperate with the Council in the conduct of this study and shall promptly provide such information as may be requested.

The Council shall complete its study and report its findings to the Governor and the General Assembly not later than November one, nineteen hundred seventy-six. [8]

Implementation of the study under the direction of the State Council of Higher Education at the beginning of the 1975-76 academic year generated many concerns and anxieties among college-university administrators, faculty, and students. Arriving on the grounds of the University of Virginia, as a 1975-76 American Council on Education Fellow, while the study was in progress was

---

[8]Virginia General Assembly, "Senate Joint Resolution No. 106," Commonwealth of Virginia, January 14, 1975, p.p. 1-2.

very significant in that an excellent opportunity was immediately available for active participation. After having attended several meetings where the study was a priority item on the agenda, it became apparant that to conduct a related study of some aspect of the University of Virginia's involvement in the Academic Tenure-Faculty Activity study would be beneficial personally and professionally, as well as informative to University officials.

To determine the impact of the study on the University was pursued by assessing the perceptions of selected legislators, State Council of Higher Education Officials, University of Virginia administrators, faculty, students, and members of the Council's Instructional Programs Advisory Committee which is comprised of academic administrators of other public institutions.

Participants In The Study

Forty-four selected individuals participated in the study by responding to an interview-questionnaire that consisted of statements collected as a result of preliminary discussions with state officials, administrators, faculty, and students. Individual interviews were held with the following interest groups:

1. Four representatives of the Virginia General Assembly
2. Two top officials of the State Council of Higher Education
3. Eight University of Virginia Administrators
4. Fifteen University of Virginia Faculty Members
5. Four University of Virginia Students
6. Eleven Academic Administrators of other public institutions and who are members of the State Council's Instructional Programs Advisory Committee (IPAC).

Basic Questions

The three basic questions which set the direction and scope of the study were as follows:

1. What factors precipitated the development and passage of Senate Joint Resolution No. 106 which directed the State Council of Higher Education to conduct a tenure-faculty workload survey among the state-supported institutions of higher education?
2. What are the perceptions of individuals representing various interest groups relative to the use of data collected by the State Council of Higher Education?
3. From the State Council's point-of-view, what questions will be answered by the data gathering process?

Analysis of Findings

Analysis of findings relative to the three basic questions is presented in this section of the study. Each of the basic questions generated sub-questions which were used as guides for individual interview purposes. The findings were organized into three sections. Section one consists of responses to the three basic questions. Selected comments of representatives of various interest groups are presented in section two. Summary and conclusions are presented in section three.

The responses of selected legislators, State Council officials, University of Virginia Administrators, faculty, students, and other academic administrators at other public institutions (IPAC) to question number one above are presented in Table 1, on page 21. The responses of selected University of Virginia administrators, faculty, students, and academic administrators at other public institutions (IPAC) to question number two above are presented in Table 2, page 23. Responses of State Council of

Higher Education officials to question number three above are presented in Table 3, page 27.

What Factors Precipitated The Development And Passage of Senate Joint Resolution No. 106 Which Directed The State Council of Higher Education to Conduct A Tenure-Faculty Workload Survey Among The State-Supported Institutions of Higher Education?

Sixty-eight percent of the respondents indicated that public discontent over the returns from investments in public higher education was a factor which influenced the Virginia General Assembly in requiring that the Academic Tenure and Faculty Workload study be conducted by the State Council of Higher Education, whereas, thirty-two percent indicated to the contrary. There was very little difference found among the responses of legislators, State Council officials, and University of Virginia Administrators, 100 percent, 100 percent, and 87 percent, respectively. However, among the faculty, students and other academic administrators (IPAC), there appears to be less confidence place in public discontent as a factor, 53 percent, 75 percent, and 45 percent, respectively.

Seventy-three percent of the respondents believed that the economic conditions over the past several years was a factor which made it necessary for legislators to begin seeking ways to cut budgets of higher education institutions. It is significant to note that legislators and IPAC administrators are less sure that economic conditions were factors, 50 percent and 45 percent, respectively, than State Council officials, University of Virginia Administrators, faculty, and students, 100 percent, 75 percent, eighty percent, and 100 percent, respectively.

Although fifty-nine percent of the respondents indicated that projected decrease in college enrollment was a factor contributing to the need to begin trimming budgets, programs, and work assignments not directly related to

teaching, the general response could be considered as doubtful. The highest percentage of "yes" responses was .67 (faculty) and the lowest percentage of "yes" responses was .25.

If budgets were trimmed by the General Assembly(legislators), the general belief of the respondents was that this activity would have very little, if any, effect upon their respective programs which have achieved national and international reputations. Forty-five percent of the respondents indicated "yes," whereas fifty-five percent indicated "no."

Sixty-four percent of the respondents were in agreement that recent law suits and court cases involving faculty appointments, reappointments, promotions, awarding tenure, and faculty pre-post tenure evaluations influenced the General Assembly in requiring that academic tenure and faculty workload data be collected. Legislators and students were in 100 percent agreement with the statement, whereas, the other responses indicated doubtfullness.

What Are The Perceptions of Individuals Representing Various Interest Groups Relative To The Use of Data Collected By The State Council of Higher Education?

Fifty-three percent of the respondents indicated that the data collection activity was necessary; fifty-five percent indicated that the data collection activity was worthwhile, whereas, eighty-seven percent indicated that the activity was time consuming. It was significant; however, that students were in 100 percent agreement that the activity was necessary, worthwhile, and time consuming.

Excluding students who did not participate in filling out the survey, all other respondents believed very strongly that participation in the data collection did not afford them the opportunity to either assess what they were actually doing relative to their academic and/or administrative responsibilities, identify

areas of responsibility that needed greater attention personally and professionally, or develop a more systematic way to keep records related to their particular assignments and expectations of their particular department, school, and the University. In each of the above instances the percentages of "yes" responses were .25, .21, and .18, respectively, as compared to those of the "no" responses of .65, .79, and .82, respectively.

The respondents overwhelmingly specified that they filled out the survey in a serious manner. The percentage which indicated "yes" was .94, whereas, the percentage which indicated "no" was .06. The Faculty Activity Survey Form is included in Appendix A.

That the legislature and State Council will use the data collected to (1) establish state workload priorities, (2) to establish criteria for financing higher education, (3) provide legislators with data which can be used to determine state returns (productivity) on tax dollars spent on higher education, (4) provide information relative to questions posed by legislators, public groups, and other institutions, (5) become more directly involved in operational matters of institutions, (6) make decisions which can affect adversely the image and prestige of the University, (7) begin looking more closely at the quality of the University's products, and (8) make the University more accountable in her attempts to achieve her mission, goals, and objectives was supported by the "yes" responses as revealed by the percentages .58, .74, .68, .87, .76, .76, .55, and .74, respectively. The responses did not support the belief that the legislature will use the data to cut from current academic programs and responsibilities perceived "luxuries;" the responses in this case yielded percentages "yes" .47, as compared to "no" .53.

From The State Council's Point-Of-View, What Questions Will Be Answered By The Data Gathering Process?

From selected State Council on Higher Education Official's point-of-view, there was 100 percent agreement regarding the use of the data collected, with the exception of the use to redefine primary faculty roles and responsibilities and to evaluate faculty performance. It was revealed by the responses that the data will be used to (1) assess the status of tenure policies and faculty workload activity throughout the Virginia system of higher education, (2) determine time spent by faculty on certain activities, (3) provide answers to questions posed by legislators, public groups, and other institutions, and (4) determine in the final analysis tenure quotas.

The State Council Officials did not believe that the data will be used to (1) develop and implement a system-wide tenure policy, (2) make decisions which will affect the ability of institutions to assume flexibility in policy development unique to thei individual missions, (3) assist in the determination of priority items for funding, (4) assist in determining whether or not requests for new degree granting programs will or should be approved, and (5) assist institutions in the re-evaluation and modification of existing policies (tenure, workload) in order that they become less vulnerable to internal/external criticisms and possible law suits.

Selected Comments

In section one of this study, an analysis was made of the responses of representatives from the various interest groups to the three basic questions which gave direction and scope of the study. As a supplement to the analysis, comments made by individuals from the various interest groups are presented in this section of the study. The comments should clarify further the perceptions of the respondents relative to the entire data gathering process.

1. Legislative Comments. The following selected comments are direct quotes from the legislators interviewed:

"The study was conducted as a result of the concern and aggressiveness of one politically powerful legislator."

"Most General Assembly members do not understand well enough the issues of tenure and faculty workloads to conduct valid discussions of the issues."

"There is some grumbling in the General Assembly about tenured faculty not teaching enough and faculty sitting around not producing."

"In Virginia there is not a whole lot of discontent, but one legislator has received, in his view, enough complaints from concerned citizens to justify actions being taken by the State to evaluate the situation."

"The matter of academic tenure is a serious question and will come up in the General Assembly. Some General Assembly members tend to want to vote tenure out."

"The courts, in the past decade or so, have demonstrated their support of academic freedom/freedom of speech; therefore, we do not need tenure policies and procedures."

"The need for academic tenure has become a philosophical question in the General Assembly. We have had enough."

"The push to study academic tenure and faculty workloads is an outgrowth of the campus turmoil during the late 60's and early 70's. It was believed that teachers were not doing their jobs."

2. University of Virginia Administrative Comments. The following selected comments are direct quotes from University administrators:

"Public discontent arises primarily due to the observation that costs of higher education have increased faster than revenues and that these increased costs may result in higher taxes on the individual. Additionally, the public realizes that other demands are being made on State revenues. This uneasiness is, I believe, reflected in the attitudes of members of the legislature. Couple this with a gloomy economic picture indicated by higher than normal unemployment and a perception of public discontent should be apparent."

"The public is concerned with the overall cost of education; our best defense and greatest need is to develop procedures for measuring the quality of our product or output."

"Any attempt to compare institutional costs or workloads can only result in a decrease in quality."

"The legislature has chosen this route because it is pressed for money."

"Controversies over tenure will continue to grow. We need tighter standards regarding promotions, reappointments, etc., with or without tenure."

"Lowering of test scores in public schools, reports of faculty paticipation in activities outside of the University, student unrest, skepticism about education, vocal faculty, and rising costs - all contributed to public discontent."

"Political support is gradually deminishing proportionately with rising costs."

"The General Assembly is growing uneasy about what it is funding."

"The legislators really want to find out what faculty members are doing."

"The main discontent was that of one or two politicians. They believe that tenured faculty are not doing their full piece of work."

"Legislators are concerned about increases in appropriations, increases in program duplications, and concerned about productivity."

"A few legislators believe that tenured senior faculty vegetate and do little once tenured and that junior faculty carry most of the teaching workload. I am sure that public discontent and misinformation had an influence on conducting the study."

3. University of Virginia Faculty Comments. Selected comments from faculty are presented below:

"The elder statesman's normal itch to interfere in matters which he doesn't understand is one of the factors which precipitated the development and passage of Senate Joint Resolution No. 106."

"..., doubtless, some individuals are mean minded enough to misuse the data to satisfy petty feelings about the University. I hope they will be a very small minority."

"Virginia does not support its higher education institutions at an even average level among the states. Yet much is expected from them. The prestige of having graduated from the University is very important to many legislators and influential persons in the state. Rejection of children of alumni or those with influence nearly always generates some pressure including financial threats."

"The passage of Senate Joint Resolution No. 106 appears to have been precipitated by a few outspoken individuals, one in particular, ...; he seems to be under the misconception that academicians and faculty do not work very hard. He could not be more wrong and misinformed, I believe, if this is his impression."

"I believe that professors were thought to be less accountable for their activities than other public servants and the legislature wanted to know what they do with their time."

"Some device, on the other hand, is necessary for demonstrating that tenured faculty really are on the job; that they are well qualified; that they are accountable in some form."

"I am not aware of public discontent over the quality of education given to the taxpayer for his dollars, although I think that there is ample reason for discontent."

"What is one man's frill is another's great longing. We could all get by on less telephoning, fewer electric typewriters, a decreased travel budget; we all need quality in faculty, sound judgement in administration - these cost money."

"We need more efficiency and equity in standards of promotion and academic freedom. Legislators are concerned about productivity in government in general. There are strange things going on in most places; we need to be straightened out. Another reason legislators are looking our way is because of the young people's revolt and the radical ideas being expressed by students."

"It was not public discontent; it was a political ploy!"

"I believe controversies over tenure, promotions, etc., intensified participation in the study and will do so in future such studies."

4. Other Academic Administrative Comments (IPAC). Selected comments from members of the State Council's Instructional Programs Advisory Committee are presented below:

"It is my understanding that the study was conducted at the insistance of one politician."

"One politician,..., felt that tenured faculty were less productive, higher paid, and performed at an inferrior level. Letters sent to the politician from students, parents, and constituents got him fired up."

"I believe the General Assembly was simply reflecting a national concern for the rapidly increasing cost of higher education and a concomitant concern for accountability."

"I did hear one State Legislator say that twelve hours(typical teaching load) was not enough time for faculty members to work."

"I believe that the information on tenure policies will be helpful. The survey will tend to make the policies more uniform throughout the state system."

"Senator ... contacts with faculty complaints and malcontents, general perception that faculty do little more than meet contact teaching requirements, desire for better information on tenure and workloads in Virginia, and accountability are the factors which precipitated the need to conduct the study."

5. Student Comments. The following selected comments represents those of students who were knowledgeable about the survey, its purpose, and its contents:

"It is perceived by legislators that tenured faculty are goofing off."

"I believe that controversies and law suits involving tenure and promotions had a significant effect upon the legislators."

"Projected decreased student enrollment will not happen at the University in the near future."

"Tenure policies, procedures need to be standardized and understandable. Students need to be involved at all levels in this process."

"The General Assembly is wise enough not to tamper with academic quality of its major universities."

"There is a need to develop a more understandable and equitable procedure for evaluating tenured and non-tenured faculty. Student input is necessary and can be most valuable in the process."

Summary, Conclusions, Recommendations

From the responses to the three basic questions which set the direction and scope of this study and from the perceptions as revealed in the selected comments of the respondents, one should be able to conclude that the Virginia General Assembly is well on it's way in joining other states, such as New York, Michigan, Florida, and California in setting into motion procedures

designed to assist it in decreasing the cost of higher education, to scrutinize more closely the activities of faculty, and to assess the status of tenure policies and procedures in institutions of higher education. The activity of the General Assembly which resulted in directing the State Council of Higher Education to conduct the study on academic tenure and faculty activity among the state-supported institutions of higher education caused much apprehension on the part of academicians concerning the use to which the data collected will be made. Yet, there is ample evidence that institutions of higher education must exert themselves more in modifying current tenure policies and practices to the extent that they become more equitable and rational in presentation and in practice. If academic tenure systems are to achieve viability and acceptability in terms of "academic freedom," "freedom of speech," and "quality of instruction," it appears that the following questions which were derived from the Keast Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education could be utilized in the review of current policies and procedures:

General

1. Are school policies regarding hiring, personnel review, promotion and tenure, post-tenure review, dismissals, sanctions, and faculty disability automatically made available to faculty members?
2. Has a formalized system been established which requires periodic review of personnel procedures?
3. If so, who participates in such a review? Are all faculty members made aware of the review and do they have an opportunity for input?
4. In what way is the existing personnel policy tied to your school's role in the University's mission?

Initial Appointment and Review

1. Upon appointment are faculty members given notice of the length of probationary period, the criteria for promotion, and the procedures used for review?
2. Are criteria discussed in other than general terms with new faculty (i.e., quality and type of publication, relationship of teaching and workload to tenure review, and amount and type of service)?
3. If so, is the outcome of this discussion ever put in writing?
4. What procedures have been developed for periodic review during the probationary period? If any, how are these reviews conducted and who has access to the material?
5. Does the Department and school have specific procedures where by teaching can be evaluated?

Reappointment

1. What are the substantive and procedural standards for the reappointment decision, are they written, who made them and what group of the faculty makes the decision?
2. Is the appointee notified when a decision will be made and given an opportunity to present relevant material in writing? In person? What material?
3. Are students involved in this process and, if so, how?
4. In what way does the school or departmental planning document play a role in renewal decisions?
5. Is the appointee notified in writing of an adverse decision?
6. May the appointee, if he requests, have reasons for an adverse decision, either orally or in writing?

7. May the appointee request and receive a reconsideration of an adverse decision? What other avenues of review are available within the college, school or department or within the University?

Tenure (in addition to the questions raised in the above items)

1. What review procedures exist for the period between reappointment and a tenure decision? How is this review carried out and by whom?
2. If such a review is formally carried out does the faculty member have access to it and is it eventually made available to the promotion committee? In what way does the tenure review committee at the departmental level or at the school level differ from the group which decided on reappointment? Are students involved and, if so, how?
3. Is outside evidence regarding the candidate solicited and, if so, about what items and in what form? Do school-wide committees take into account the varied workload and publication practices distinctive to a discipline? If so, how is such information obtained and evaluated?
4. If no formal school-wide or departmental policy exists regarding the evaluation of teaching, in what way is teaching taken into account by the school-wide committee?

Post-Tenure Review

1. What criteria are used for post-tenure evaluation?
2. Is such evaluation carried out on a periodic basis and, if so, by whom?
3. Does the faculty member have access to such evaluation and a method for responding to it if he or she should so desire?
4. To whom is the post-tenure evaluation forwarded and in what form?[9]

---

[9]Commission on Academic Tenure In Higher Education, Faculty Tenure, A Report and Recommendations, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Pub. 1973), p.p. 23-92.

Institutions of higher education, using the University of Virginia as an example, must come forth with the leadership necessary to slow down the increasing tendency of groups and individuals in the larger society to criticize higher education as not being accountable to the publics they serve. This leadership must be one that can demonstrate the ability of institutions of higher education to promote the best possible teaching and learning environment which will ensure quality products in the production of knowledge, in students as they address the political, social, and economic needs of society, and in service to the communities where they reside. Only the future will tell whether or not higher education, through leadership, was successful in rebuilding public confidence.

TABLE 1

RESPONSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF VARIOUS INTEREST GROUPS REGARDING THE FACTORS WHICH PRECIPITATED THE DEVELOPMENT AND PASSAGE OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NUMBER 106

Interview Questions	N=4 Legislators		N=2 State Council On Higher Education Officials		N=8 Administrators University of Virginia		N=15 Faculty University of Virginia		N=4 Students University of Virginia		N=11 Instructional Programs Advisory Committee-State System of Higher Ed. Acad. Admin.		N=44 Total Responses	
	%Yes	%No	%Yes	%No	%Yes	%No	%Yes	%No	%Yes	%No	%Yes	%No	%Yes	%No
1. Did increased public discontent over the returns from investments in public higher education influence in any way the actions of the Virginia Assembly in requiring that such a survey be conducted by the State Council of Higher Education?	100	0	100	0	87	12	53	47	75	25	55	45	68	32
2. Do you believe that the economic conditions over the past several years made it necessary for legislators to begin seeking ways to cut budgets of higher education institutions?	50	50	100	0	75	25	80	20	100	0	55	45	73	27
3 Is there a possibility that recent reports which predicted decreased student populations in higher education signaled to legislators, state officials and university officials that they should begin now trimming budgets, programs, and work assignments of faculty not directly related to teaching?	25	75	50	50	63	37	67	33	50	50	55	45	59	41

TABLE 1 Cont'd

	Legislators		State Council On Higher Education Officials		Administrators University of Virginia		Faculty University of Virginia		Students University of Virginia		Instructional Programs Advisory Committee-State System of Higher Ed. Acad. Admin.		Total Responses	
	%Yes	%No	%Yes	%No	%Yes	%No	%Yes	%No	%Yes	%No	%Yes	%No	%Yes	%No
4. If so, what effect do you believe this will have over the academic status of colleges and universities and their respective programs which have national and international reputations?	25	75	50	50	63	37	53	47	50	50	27	73	45	55
5. What effect, if any, did recent controversies, law suits, and court cases involving faculty appointments, reappointments, promotions, awarding tenure, and faculty pre-post tenure evaluations have on the need to collect data to be used in response to future questions posed by legislators, public groups, and institutions?	100	0	50	50	63	37	60	40	100	0	45	55	64	36
6. What is the estimated cost of the study? (For other public institutions the cost will run on the avg. of $5,000 - 10,000)			$40,000 - 50,000		$10,000									

TABLE 2

*PERCEPTIONS OF UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATORS, FACULTY, AND STUDENTS RELATIVE TO THE USE OF FACULTY TENURE AND WORKLOAD DATA COLLECTED BY THE STATE COUNCIL ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Interview Questions	University of Virginia Administrators (N=8)		**Instructional Programs Advisory Committee (N=11)		University of Virginia Faculty (N=15)		***University of Virginia Students (N=4)		Total (N=38)	
	%Yes	%No	%Yes	%No	%Yes	%No	%Yes	%No	%Yes	%No
1. Do you believe that the data collection activity was:										
Necessary?	50	50	45	55	47	53	100	0	53	47
Worthwhile?	38	62	55	45	53	47	100	0	55	45
Time consuming?	100	0	82	18	80	20	100	0	87	13
2. After having participated in the activity, do you feel that you were given the opportunity to:										
Assess what you were actually doing relative to your academic and/or administrative responsibilities;	38	62	27	73	40	60	NA	NA	35	65
Identify areas of your responsibilities that needed greater attention personally and professionally;	13	87	18	82	27	73	NA	NA	21	79
Develop a more systematic way to keep records related to your particular assignment and expectations of your department, school, and the University?	13	87	36	64	6	94	NA	NA	18	82

TABLE 2 Cont'd

Interview Questions	University of Virginia Administrators		**Instructional Programs Advisory Committee		University of Virginia Faculty		**University of Virginia Students		Total	
	%Yes	%No	%Yes	%No	%Yes	%No	%Yes	%No	%Yes	%No
3. In filling out the survey (workload), did you approach the task in a serious manner?	100	0	91	9	93	7	NA	NA	94	6
4. Do you think that the data will be used by the State Council and/or the legislature to:										
Establish state workload priorities, i.e., more teaching-less research;	88	12	45	55	47	53	75	25	58	42
Establish criteria for financing higher education, i.e., programs, facilities, positions;	88	12	64	36	67	33	100	0	74	26
Provide legislators with data which can be used to determine state returns on tax dollars spent on higher education;	75	25	64	36	73	27	50	50	68	32
Provide information relative to questions posed by legislators, public groups, and other institutions;	100	0	82	18	80	20	100	0	87	13

TABLE 2 Cont'd

Interview Questions	University of Virginia Administrators		**Instructional Program Advisory Committee		University of Virginia Faculty		***University of Virginia Students		Total	
	%Yes	%No	%Yes	%No	%Yes	%No	%Yes	%No	%Yes	%No
Become more directly involved in operational matters of institutions which can affect adversely the flexibility, creativity, and academic freedom inherent in the current operation of respective schools and departments;	100	0	73	27	73	27	50	50	76	24
Make decisions which can affect adversely the image and prestige of the University, School, and/or department - making anh one of them less competitive with other institutions of similar size and reputation;	88	12	55	45	80	20	100	0	76	24
Begin looking more closely at the quality of the University's products;	63	37	36	64	60	40	75	25	55	45
Cut from current academic programs and responsibilities perceived luxuries - "A return to the basics;"	75	25	36	64	40	60	50	50	47	53

TABLE 2 Cont'd

Interview Questions	University of Virginia Administrators		**Instructional Programs Advisory Committee		University of Virginia Faculty		***University of Virginia Students		Total	
	%Yes	%No	%Yes	%No	%Yes	%No	%Yes	%No	%Yes	%No
Make the University more accountable in her attempts to achieve her mission, goals, and objectives?	100	0	55	45	73	27	75	25	74	26

TABLE 3

RESPONSES OF SELECTED STATE COUNCIL OF HIGHER EDUCATION OFFICIALS REGARDING QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED BY THE DATA GATHERING PROCESS
(N=2)

Interview Questions	% Yes	% No
1. Will the data be used to assess the status of tenure policies and faculty workload activity throughout the Virginia System of Higher Education?	100	0
2. Will the data collection process result in the future development and implementation of a system-wide tenure policy?	0	100
3. If so, what effect will this development have on the ability of individual institutions to assume some flexibility in policy development unique to their individual missions?	0	100
4. Will faculty workload data collected be used to:		
Determine time spent by faculty on certain activities, i.e., teaching, research, administration, etc;	100	0
Provide answers to questions posed by legislators, public groups, and other institutions;	100	0
Assist in the determination of priority items for funding;	0	100
Redefine faculty primary roles and responsibilities;	50	50
Evaluate faculty performance;	50	50

TABLE 3 Cont'd

Interview Questions	% Yes	% No
Determine in the final analysis tenure quotas;	100	0
Assist in determining whether or not requests for new degree granting programs will and/or should be approved;	0	100
Assist in determining areas which may be considered luxury items and which may eventually become non-state funding items;	0	100
Assist institutions in the re-evaluation and modification of existing policies in order that they become less vulnerable to internal and external criticisms and possible law suits?	0	100

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Carr, Robert K. "The Uneasy Future of Academic Tenure," Educational Record, Spring 1972.

Commission on Academic Tenure In Higher Education. Faculty Tenure, A Report and Recommendations, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.

Hechinger, Fred M. "Murder In Academe: The Demise of Education," Saturday Review, March 20, 1976.

Lussier, Virginia Lee."Faculty Bargaining Associations," Journal of Higher Education, Vol. XLVI, No. 5, September/October 1975.

Virginia General Assembly Commission On Higher Education, Report of the General Assembly Commission on Higher Education, Richmond, Virginia: Commonwealth of Virginia, 1974.

Virginia General Assembly, "Senate Joint Resolution No. 106," Richmond, Virginia: Commonwealth of Virginia, 1975.

AAIP ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY REPLY FORM

Name: Dr. Robert T. Greene

Title: Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs
Virginia Union University
1500 Lombardy Street
Address: Richmond, Virginia 23220 (Zip)

Paper or Material Title(s): The Impact of the Commonwealth of Virginia's State Supported Colleges and Universities Academic Tenure and Faculty Activity Study Conducted by the State Council of Higher Education on the University of Virginia.

Annotation (limited to five typed lines):

The paper represents a compilation of perceptions of individuals toward the survey of academic tenure policies and faculty workloads at Virginia's State supported Cplleges and Universities conducted by the Virginia State Council of Higher Education.

Return no later than May 14 to:

Dr. Thomas M. Stauffer
AAIP Director
American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle
Washington, D. C. 20036